SOCIALIST APPEAL

An Organ of Revolutionary Socialism

Volume II. No. 1. OCTOBER, 1935 Price 5 cents

FROM OUR VIEWPOINT

RIGHT WING OF NEW YORK MOVES TO EXPEL MILITANTS

Almost at the very last moment prior to going to press we received a communication from New York to the following effect:

1) The State Executive Committee of New York directed Local New York to expel Abe Kruger from the Socialist Party for "the advocacy of communism." (See section of article by Jack Altman and Harold Siegel, dealing with the Kruger Case). The Central Committee of Local New York refused to concur in the action of the State Executive Committee. The right wing could not muster the necessary two-thirds vote. The right wing has openly stated that the State Committee will revoke the Charter of Local New York and reorganize the Local.

2) The New York City Executive Committee passed a motion to the effect "that only literature and newspapers approved by the City Executive Committee shall be distributed and sold at all meetings (street or hall) arranged by the Socialist Party of New York City and all branches of the Socialist Party."

The determination of the New York old guard to expel all those who do not agree with the decrepit socialism that it stands for should now be clear even to those who were naive enough to believe that the "peace pact" agreed to by the right wing and timid centrist majority of the National Executive Committee, would bring harmony into the party.

If the State Executive Committee reorganizes Local New York there will in effect be two Socialist Parties in New York. To be more accurate there will be two parties called 'Socialist,' one of which, dominated by the right wing, will be nothing but a tail to the La Guardia administration. The revolutionary left wing of the country will recognize the left wing of New York as the only real Socialist Party.

What will the National Executive Committee do? We of course have very little faith that it will do anything. In a critical situation Hoan and his followers will support their blood-bothers of New York.

At any rate the militant revolutionary socialists of the whole country must, in resolutions and communications to the National Executive Committee, make it clear that they will not permit the expulsion of the left wing of the New York party.

The fate of the revolutionary socialists in the whole country is tied up with the fate of the New York left wing. The majority of the N. E. C. should not forget that.

The motion of the City Executive Committee that literature sold at Socialist meetings must first have its approval has the obvious purpose of preventing the sale of the Socialist Call. The only effective answer to such an unwarranted motion is to triple and quadruple the sale of the Call not only in New York but all over the country.

THE SOCIALIST CALL INSTITUTE

IN THE development of the socialist movement the conference held at Boundrook, New Jersey during the week-end of September 7-8 has a significance which cannot be overestimated. It was held under the auspices of the Socialist Call and consequently can with justification be designated as a conference of revolutionary socialists. It is true that the Call has weaknesses which do not as yet entitle it to be considered a revolutionary socialist propaganda paper but it does represent to a certain extent the revolutionary tendencies in the Socialist party and any conference held under its auspices will necessarily be a conference of those elements within our party that strive to make of the party a revolutionary instrument.

The great significance of the conference lies in the fact that for the first time the leftward moving elements in the Socialist party have attempted to come together and formulate a program and work out resolutions on important problems confronting the world socialist movement which program and resolutions would form the basis of an organized left wing movement on a national scale. For a long time the question could be and was asked of those members of the Socialist party who consider themselves Militants or left wingers: What do you stand for? What principles and tactics do you advocate? The answer could at best be vague. There were no documents to which the questioner could be referred. Every one with left wing tendencies could give his own interpretation of the basic principles and tactics of the left wing.

That the declaration of principles adopted at the Detroit convention could not possibly serve as a theoretical basis for an organized left wing movement became clear to everyone after the New York meeting of the National Executive Committee where the notorious "peace pact" was adopted. It must now be accepted without argument that any document supported by Hoan and all other municipal socialists is fundamentally defective and cannot form the basis of a left wing movement. What was absolutely necessary was to formulate a theoretical position which would sharply distinguish the revolutionary socialists from the right wing and also from the hesitating centrist elements.

To claim that this important task was accomplished at the Boundbrook conference would be absurd. We can and we do claim that only a beginning was made at that conference. The consummation of that task is still in the future. A provisional program was presented which no one claims to be a perfect document; skeleton resolutions were prepared; various viewpoints were presented during the discussion; the documents introduced were referred to a committee to be revised and amended. To dismiss all this as unimportant and to declare, as does the New Militant, organ of the Workers Party, that "Militant's Confab Proves a Failure" because it was "inconclusive and took no definite steps" is a shortsighted attitude which has nothing in common with Marxist criticism.

Other similar conferences are scheduled to take place. There will be a mid-west conference held at Chicago; there will be one held in one of the New England states. Discussions with reference to the program and resolutions will continue. A final draft will be formulated only after these discussions.

We can even assume that the final draft will not be perfect. But only pure revolutionary sects are able to produce perfect programmatic documents. The declaration of principles of our critics from the Workers' Party is severely criticized by the leftist sectarian groups. And the very criticisms which the writer in the Militant makes of the draft program are made of the Workers' Party declaration of principles by the sectarians. The phrase "armed insurrection" which to all leftists is the sine qua non of any revolutionary program is omitted from the W. P. declaration and it is hardly in good taste for any member of that party to criticise the draft program for failure to describe "the nature of the civil war attending the conquest of power". Even if the W. P. declaration did describe in detail the

exact nature of the armed insurrection attending the conquest of power we would feel that it would be perfectly correct to omit such a description. As it is we can, in addition to contending that we are correct, also say something about people who live in glass houses.

We are far from resenting criticism. We shall have opportunity to criticize the program in detail. Some of the points made by members of small revolutionary groups with reference to the provisional program are undoubtedly correct and we hope that the final draft will correct the errors. But a criticism which sweeps away the whole program and declares the conference a failure is not even worth discussing.

At the Boundbrook conference the left wing began the laying of a firm foundation for an organized revolutionary left-wing movement. The program that will ultimately come out will be a program which the left wing will present to the whole membership of the Socialist party to be accepted by the party at its next convention. It will not be a program for the left wing exclusively but a program of the left wing for the party. It will be a program which, if accepted by the party as a whole, will steer it in the right direction, in the direction of organizing the American workers for a victorious struggle for power.

We have been careful in saying that all the Boundbrook conference did was simply to make a beginning. In the socialist movement too frequently has it happened that revolutionary principles are accepted in the abstract without having any effect upon the daily activities of those who accept them. This is a typical centrist fault. It is true that revolutionary practice is impossible without revolutionary theory but it is also true that a revolutionary theory does not necessarily result in revolutionary practice. With the acceptance of a revolutionary program our task is far from ending. We must all the more carefully watch our daily activities so that they be in consonance with our revolutionary theory.

In the bitter struggle that lies before us there must be no hesitation. We must not hesitate to criticise ourselves and those with whom we are closely connected. Only by adopting a revolutionary Marxist attitude which above all means a critical attitude can we succeed in building a left wing and a party that will be more than a mere haven for tired radicals and ambitious burocrats and careerists.

The Boundbrook conference will be of historical significance if we carry out all its implications.

SOCIALISTS AND THE ITALIAN-ETHIOPIAN CONFLICT

THE National Executive Committee of our party correctly surmised that the contemplated attack of Italy upon the Ethiopian people was important enough and serious enough to justify the issuing of an appeal to the American workers to support the Ethiopian people. Perhaps we should be grateful for such little favors and not look too carefully at the contents of the proclamation. But alas we need not look too carefully at the contents to convince us that as revolutionary socialists we must protest and vigorously at that.

We had a vague suspicion that our N E C had something to do with the socialist movement. We therefore half expected that a proclamation coming from the N E C dealing with such a vital problem as an immediately threatening attack by an imperialist power would say something with reference to capitalism being the fundamental cause of imperialist war and with reference to socialism as the only guarantee of permanent peace. Knowing the character of the N E C we hardly expected a revolutionary socialist proclamation but we did hope for a vaguely socialist proclamation.

The word 'socialism' cannot be found in the proclamation except when mention is made of the Labor and Socialist International. Neither does the word 'capitalism' occur. It would be absurd for us to insist that those words must be used in every socialist proclamation although we can hardly conceive of the possibility that they would be altogether omitted. We simply mean to indicate that the proclamation has absolutely no socialist character whatsoever about it. The mildest type of liberal could vote for that proclamation with both hands. As a matter of fact no supporter of the capitalist system could possibly take offense at it, excluding a principled fascist.

What an enthusiastic greeting the proclamation should receive at the hands of the Stalinists! It contains the fundamental premise of the communists that at the present time only the reactionary powers, Italy, Germany and Japan will be responsible for any war. The inference is clear that the other capitalist powers are not reactionary and are not to be held responsible for any conflict.

"The enemy of all that is best in modern civilization.... is to be found in the fascist and aggressive militarist nations like Italy, Germany and Japan" categorically asserts the N E C in its statement. What conclusion can the workers draw from this solemn pronouncement? That capitalism is not the enemy; only fascism. If the dominant elements of the N E C had any political sense they would immediately accept every united-front offer of the communists. There are no theoretical differences between those two camps. In France where the situation is critical the right wing socialists have some political acumen and are not governed by the prejudices of yesterday and consequently find no difficulty in working together with the burocrats of the Communist party against the revolutionary socialist elements.

Position of Norman Thomas

We presume that Comrade Thomas read the NEC proclamation and realized that it is not exactly in harmony with his position of supporting the neutrality resolution introduced in congress. Thomas was not satisfied with that resolution because he was in favor of a more strict neutrality than that provided for by the resolution. In his later comments on the war situation Thomas dos not at all make clear what attitude he takes towards the problem of neutrality. He seems to have veered around to the N E C position of a boycott against Italy and not against Etriopia, which is correct.

No argument should be necessary to convince a revolutionary socialist that it is impossible for a Socialist party to be neutral in a war between an imperialist robber country and a semi-colonial people. We must call upon the workers to do all they can to defeat the imperialist power because the interests of the international working class demands the defeat of any imperialist power attempting to enslave a backward people.

This does not mean that we should agitate to have our own capitalist government place an embargo on Italy. In a case where war is involved the working class must play its role independently of the capitalist government. We can have no faith whatever in any motives of a government representing the capitalist class. We would be bitterly opposed to having our "own" government declare war on Italy because we know that it would do so only to protect its own imperialist interests and not to help Ethiopia.

Reformist Socialists and Communists Help their Capitalist Governments

The Labor and Socialist International, the International Federation of Trade Unions together with the Communist International have come out for sanctions by the League of Nations against Italy. THIS IS THE BETRAYAL OF 1914 OVER AGAIN.

We are against supporting any capitalist government in any war. Revolutionary socialists are for revolutionary defeatism. The reformist socialists and the communists have now openly shown that they are birds of one feather. The threatening war has shown clearly that a united front of reformists and Stalinists against revolutionary socialists is inevitable.

Pacifism and Confusion

In the lead of those who demand that the capitalist governments apply sanctions against Mussolini are the British labor leaders, as was to be expected. That party is more than anxious to show its readiness to defend the interests of British imperialism. George Lansbury and Arthur Ponsonby of the British Labor party have come out in opposition to sanctions because they are opposed to a "peace by force policy." This is a pacifist position with which revolutionary socialists can have nothing in common. The attitude of Stafford Cripps is a highly confused one. As John Cripps admits in an article in the Socialist Call "its practical results would be very similar to that of Comrade Lansbury". Cripps says he will not support sanctions as long as it is in favor of an imperialist government but his methods of doing away with imperialists

(Continued on page 8)

IN NEW YORK SINCE THE "PEACE PACT"

by Jack Altman and Harold Siegel

MEMBERS OF the Socialist Party throughout the country breathed a sigh of relief when the so-called "peace pact" was negotiated at the New York meeting of the National Executive Committee. They had expectations that some kind of organizational unity could be achieved. However, the Militants of New York, while accepting the pact in the spirit of discipline, were not too sanguine. It must be remembered that the pact was drawn between the N.E.C. and the New York State Committee. The Militants as an interested faction were not consulted. In fact the representatives of the New York State Committee, when confronted with the possibility of conferring with the leadership of the Militants in the presence of the National Executive Committee, stated emphatically that if the Militants were called in they would refuse to continue negotiations with the National Executive Committee, and would stand by their original position.

The Old Guard soon flew its colors. Louis Waldman, New York State Chairman, at a meeting of the Jewish Verband in New York stated that the peace did not include the Militants. It was merely a contract between the State Committee and the N.E.C. He made it clear that so far as the Old Guard was concerned there could be no peace in the Party until the Militants were driven out.

Despite the above, the New York Militants accepted the "peace pact" in good faith and tried to carry it out, although they were under no illusions as to the intransigent position of the old guard. This can be proven by the position taken by the militants at the first meeting of the Central Committee immediately after the "peace pact" was signed.

At this meeting, a leading militant made a motion to dispense with all the previous minutes. Motion after motion was made by militants proposing activity, as the report of the Central Committee, in the "Socialist Call" and The "New Leader" of August 7th will bear out.

However, it is worth while, in the light of what may happen in the future, to take up specifically all the important questions arising subsequent to the "pact" —questions that are bringing division and bitterness into New York.

The Picnic at Ulmer Park

A week after the Central Committee meeting and two weeks after the "peace pact'" Local New York held its annual picinic at Ulmer Park. At this picnic, although the New York State Committee had already stated that it would re-instate the Yipsels, a large sign greeted the people coming into the park, saying: "Join the Young Socialist Alliance," the organization which the old guard created to take the place of the Yipsels.

Yipsels selling the official YPSL pamphlet "Make Freedom Constitutional" were stopped, in many cases forcibly.

Comrades selling the "Socialist Call" had their "Calls" taken away from them and some of them were beaten by the special police in the park.

The Kruger Case

A. N. Kruger, a member of the City Central Committee, was brought up on charges of advocating communism. The evidence was a letter sent by Comrade Kruger, who at that time was working for the "New Leader," to comrades in charge of the "Jamestown Labor News" to which he had been recommended as editor by the "New Leader" In this letter he stated that he believes in some of the ideas that are commonly known as communism and made a distinction between his beliefs and those of the Communist Party.

Kruger's defense was simple. He admitted writing the letter and that the letter accurately stated his position. However, as a disciplined party member, he would accept the N E C decision even to the extent of not urging his viewpoint among the membership.

A motion to expel which requires a two-thirds vote was defeated. Julius Gerber then stated that he would appeal this case to the State Committee. It was then carried by a majority vote that Kruger be suspended until the State Committee acts on Gerber's appeal. This was done despite the fact that only the defendant can appeal to the State Committee on a disciplinary action.

There are quite a number of comrades who must answer similar charges. The old guard, fortified by the "peace pact", is continuing its heresy hunt for the purpose of eliminatiing all opposition.

Queens County Committee

During the period of the intense fight in Local New York the old guard organized new branches by taking out right wingers from militant branches and bestowing charters upon them. According to the constitution branches can be organized only through the County Committee. The Queens County Committee refused to permit the organization of the branches in question on the ground that they were being organized for factional reasons only and that there was no need for additional branches in the particular localities. Despite the objection of the County Committee Local New York chartered these branches and the County Committee refused to seat their delegates. The County Committee had also condemned the Jewish Daily Forward for its anti-socialist conduct.

Local New York has demanded that Queens County Committee rescind these two actions by September 20th or suffer the penalty of reorganization. This will mean the expulsion of leading members of Queens County. At the time of writing we do not know what action Queens County will take but we are sure that they will not fall into the trap set by the right wing.

Unemployed Work

At the City Central Committee meeting immediately after the "peace pact" motions were made for Party activity. Many of these motions specifically referred to work among the unemployed. The City Central Committee felt that it did not have enough time to take up each item separately and referred them to the Executive Committee. After the Executive Committee labored for two and one-half months activity was born. **It discharged Saul Parker as Secretary of the Unemployed Committee**, on the ground that "The Unemployed Union is not an official Party organization". This despite the fact that the Unemployed Union has been organized for more than two years, and Saul Parker has been working in this capacity for more than a year and a half, at the salary of $10 a week.

What this means is that the Unemployed Union is not a tool of the old guard, and as such, they refuse to do anything to support it. If this is not the case, then it is the blindest kind of sectarianism for a Party like ours.

This is another sign of peace — the peace of the grave.

Julius Gerber

Julius Gerber, who is the cause of a great deal of the trouble in New York because of his emotional instability and lack of initiative resigned during the heat of the fight, although he never relinquished his place in the Party office, and still wrote official letters in his name.

He resigned at that time to take over the duties of Secretary for the Eastern State Conference, which was nothing more nor less than the direction and planning of the expected split. In that capacity he sent out the most scurrilous literature, even to non-Party members, attacking the National Executive Committee, as well as Party members.

During this period Julius Gerber decided to run as President of the Sheet Metal Workers Union, and when he was defeated was again nominated for Executive Secretary of New York, although those members of the Executive Committe electing him knew full well the resentment this would cause among Party members. But it seems that "peace pact" or no "peace pact", their factional representative must be in office, and Julius Gerber was elected. The vote on this question, as it is on most questions, was very close. On a roll-call vote, 45 for Julius Gerber, 36 against. This does not represent the true opposition to him, because we feel that in a referendum he would be defeated.

The Teachers' Union

The merits of the Teachers' Union case cannot be treated here, except insofar as it touches upon the fight in New York.

About eight or nine months ago Louis Waldman raised the question of the Socialist group in the Teachers' Union, and he seems to have given lots of guidance, from his own vast experience, to those who have wanted to split the Union. The actions of the administration group in the Teachers' Union have followed almost in every detail the actions pursued by Louis

Waldman and his group after the National Convention of the Socialist Party, with only this difference.

Linville and his group resigned, in the hope that the A. F. of L. Convention will revoke the charter of the A. F. of T. while Louis Waldman could only depend upon the Labor and Socialist International for such an action, and it seemed too slender a reed to lean upon.

The method used by the old guard in this instance is indicative of its general policy. The columns of the "New Leader," a so--called Socialist organ, were thrown open to Abraham Lefkowitz, a non-Party member, in which he viciously attacked leading members of the Socialist Party, including a member of the National Executive Committee. This article attacking Socialists was adverised by the "New Leader" in the "New York Post" and in the "New York World Telegram", through paid advertising, thus calling the attention of even non-Socialists to an attack on Socialists, in a so-called Socialist organ. This was done without giving an opportunity to those members of the Party who were attacked to answer in the same issue.

Indicative of old guard ethics, a "red scare" headline was given to the article. It was so vicious that even Lefkowitz publicly repudiated the headline, making it very clear that he was in no way responsible.

Again the old guard steps in and acts with a group that is ready to split a national A. F. of L. organization. We are convinced that the vast majority of Socialist teachers and of Party members feel disgusted with this exhibition.

The Young People's Socialist League

Immediately following the NEC meeting the Yipsels appeared before the Executive Committee requesting the election of a committee to work out the program for re-instatement. This was done and the committee laid down conditions for the re-instatement of the Yipsels. Amongst the conditions were the following:

1. That all decisions of the Local are binding and will be obeyed by the YPSL and that the YPSL may not adopt any resolution, declaration or statement on questions of socialist principles policies or tactics.

2. Should there be any disagreement between the Executive Committee of Local New York and the YPSL of New York the decision of Local New York shall stand unless overruled by the State Committee of New York.

3. All activities of the YPSL except that of education shall be under the direct control of the Committee of Youth Activities of Local N. Y. and all committees must operate through the Committee on Youth Activities.

4. The educational work of the YPSL shall be under the direct control of the Committee on Education of Local N. Y. and the Committee on Youth Activities to have a representative on the Committee on Education.

These conditions were completely contrary to the letter and spirit of the NEC meeting and the YPSL was compelled to reject them. The Yipsels would simply be children doing the dirty work of the Party without the privileges of even a branch of the Party.

Point 2 was so obviously contrary to the NEC decision that the old guard realized that they made a mistake and on August 28, laid down the following new conditions, which were the conditions of the NEC.

"1. That the YPSL conform to the decision of Local New York; 2. that no disciplinary action be taken by the YPSL against members of the Young Socialist Alliance; and (3) that all members and circles be reinstated with all rights and privileges. There is therefore no need for further negotiations and unless the YPSL reinstate itself with Local New York by September 10th, 1935, Local New York will notify the State Committee of New York and the NEC that the YPSL has failed to live up to the decision of the NEC and the agreement between the NEC and the New York State Committee".

However the old guard refused to renounce or repudiate the conditions they laid down in the first instance, conditions which were contrary to the August 28th resolution. In fact Julius Gerber stated at a meeting of the City Central Committee that these conditions would be applied as soon as the Yipsels would be reinstated. The Yipsels of course have refused to put their heads into the noose of the old guard.

This is only part of the story.

Local New York is laying down specific rules and more dissipline of a negative kind than even the Communist party, but it still allows Socialists to fight Socialists in the unions and refuses to lay down a policy for work in outside organizations. All this indicates an unprincipled desire to keep power for the sake of power and a policy that will bring ruin to the Party, not unity.

THIS QUESTION OF THE YPSL

By Ben Fischer

I.

AMONG PARTY comrades, not much effort has been made to evaluate the role, the function and the prospects of the Young People's Socialist League. But much attention has been given to the conflict in New York between the League and Party. Intelligent consideration of that dispute can be given only upon the basis of an understanding of the YPSL.

The YPSL has two, and only two tasks:

1. To help the Party become the political guide for the workingclass revolution.

2. To win over the youth for active support of that revolution.

II.

How is the YPSL to help the Party become the political guide for the working class revolution? There are five ways:

1. By preparing its members for effective Party membership. This necessarily means to make them much more capable then even most of the Party leaders are today.
2. By being a constant source of criticism and examination of party policy and tactics. Just as trade unionists must do this; just as branches, locals, state organizations, the NEC and the National Conventions must do this;—so also the Yipsels must reach into their background, their problems and the lessons of their Socialist experience to contribute their voice to the many voices which blend themselves into Party policy and decisions. Yipsels are the socialists of the rising generation. They are reflections of and reactions to new conditions. They bring into the movement a new vigor, and a new attitude which to a considerable extent is typical of the rising generation. Our Party, which must always adapt itself to new conditions and new attitudes, should realize the importance of the point of view and the criticisms of the younger elements. Just as stability and experience are vital to the movement, so also youth and the attitude of the rising generation are vital to the movement.
3. By bringing people with whom they come into contact in the course of their work on the various fields of youth activity into the Party. Where these persons are above 30 years of age, they are brought directly into the Party. Where they are below thirty, they are brought into the Yipsels and then into the Party. Yipsels above 21, who have been in the YPSL for 6 months or more, MUST apply for membership to the Party.
4. By opposing all efforts to frustrate the Party by converting it into an organization whose main orientation is towards municipal socialism and enthusiastic acquiescence to every word and gesture of trade union officials.
5. By resisting every effort to expel loyal Party members whose only "crime" is adherence to revolutionary Socialist principles and policies.

Why are these things functions of the YPSL? Shouldn't the YPSL keep out of Party affairs? These questions are constantly posed.

Young people who are giving their lives to the movement will not keep out of Party affairs. The Party is our Party. It is the Party we live and fight for. It is the Party which is our hope and our source of courage. When it is endangered from the outside, we fight for its welfare. When it is en-

dangered as an effective revolutionary instrument from within, we fight just as strenuously to preserve it for revolutionary Socialism.

But why "use" the YPSL, we are asked. Because it is our organization; it is where we find ourselves. People strive to achieve a purpose through organization of like-minded persons. By and large, we in the YPSL are like-minded. Therefore, being together in our organization, we act together through our organization.

But why not act through Party membership? Because then the YPSL would be removed from the realities of the work and interests of its membership. How can we come to YPSL meetings and close our ears to the vital nature of the Party controversy? Branches and locals have tried that and fallen apart. YPSL circles would react no differently from Party branches.

Then does this mean that the YPSL must participate in every controversy? No, but when our Party is in danger of degenerating or when it is being destroyed by attempts to expel left-wing elements, then the YPSL is concerned. It would be treachery for the members of the League—most of whom are left-wing—not to fight for the Party and the principles to which they are devoted.

III.

How is the YPSL to win over the youth for Socialism?

1. By our members going to the youth wherever they are—in unions, in student groups, in settlement houses, in churches, in Y's. We must go to them because economic forces will not bring them to us through the trade unions—as we had once thought. Millions of young people will never have the opportunity to join trade unions.
2. By developing ourselves to become able workers in youth groups and unions and able exponents of our program and policies.
3. By developing through education and experience a membership which can create correct policies.
4. By developing effective methods of working with students, young trade unionists and the other elements to whom we can possibly appeal.
5. By dramatizing and systematizing our work.
6. By meeting rival youth groups squarely. It does the YPSL no good to bury its head and not recognize the existence of the Young Communist League and even of the minor groups in the radical movement. The YCL has great influence among the youth, probably as great or even greater than we have. We must present our program in contradistinction to theirs to young people.

Can we do all these things? Certainly—if our membership develops; if Party comrades aid our work; if more mature elements can be attracted to the League in larger numbers.

This approach depends on the conception that we are not a group unto ourselves which is to grow only from within. We are an organization which must reach out and bring the youth to our movement. We must train ourselves and gear our organization in such a way as to make it possible for the Yipsels to become a corps of active fighters and organizers for Socialism. Each of us must live for the movement. Each of us must fearlessly go to the gathering places of young people, to the scenes of the struggles of youth, to imbue youth with our doctrines and impress them with the need for organizing for Socialist triumph. To educate youth is important. But in addition to education, we must be the most active and clear-headed participants and leaders in the struggles of the unemployed youth, the trade union youth, the anti-war movement and every field in which youth fights for progressive aims and better conditions.

IV.

There is a different approach from the one outlined above. It is the approach of the right wing. It says that the YPSL has as its tasks aiding the Party, growing in size, preparing people for Party membership and affording young Socialists with cultural, sports and general educational opportunities.

This approach reminds one of the Young Circle League, the youth section of the Workmen's Circle. Substitute "Workmen's Circle" for "Party" in the above paragraph and you have outlined the tasks of the Young Circle League as proposed by the right wing for the YPSL.

The YPSL should **aid the Party**; but to the right wing that phrase means one thing only—the Yipsels should be the leaflet distributors and errand boys for the Party, because in so many places, many Party members don't like to do the Jimmy Higgins work of the movement.

The YPSL should **grow in size**; but what about developing its members, building mass organizations for young people not yet ready to become affiliated with a political youth organization? What about the Yipsel's growing in influence and ability and experience. Growing in size if not qualified, can only mean growing into a loose cultural vaguely Socialist organization. We do not want this.

Preparing people for Party membership is fine. But we want Yipsels to be intelligent, capable Party members—not just one more in the army of dues-payers.

Affording sports and cultural activities is the task not of the YPSL, but of the Workers' Sport League, Rebel Arts, the Young Circle League and similar groups.

Affording educational opportunities? The Rand School when it was alive attracted many New York Yipsels. The right wingers thought that education meant bawling out Yipsels for being young, for being critical of an older generation of Socialists who had left no great marks of success though fine marks of courage and loyalty. Students became disgusted or embittered. They came for knowledge and received sermons from the Mount of 30 years of Experience which were not to be questioned or doubted but merely accepted.

The right wing has done a miserable job in the field of education. The YPSL itself, with its feeble resources and facilities has even done better.

These two approches towards the YPSL are before us now. The Yipsels have declared their preference in many ways. The right wing has summed up its preference very simply. August 14th, the Local New York Executive Committee provided that as conditions of reinstatement of the New York Yipsels the latter must accept the following—"That all decisions of the Local are binding and will be obeyed by the YPSL, and that the YPSL in NYC may not adopt any resolution, declaration or statement on questions of socialist principles, policies or tactics;" and in the same decision, "All activities of the YPSL except that of Education shall be under the direct control of the Committee on Youth Activities of Local New York and all committees must operate through the Committee on Youth Activities. The Educational work of the YPSL shall be under the direct control and supervision of the Committee on Education of Local New York and the Committee on Youth Activities to have a representative on the Committee on Education."

Here it is in so many words—the right wing has expressed its point of view.

If the New York Yipsels must accept the Local New York terms, then the Old Guard point of view wins out. The chance of developing a political youth organization for Socialism dies, unless the fight for a real YPSL can win.

Socialism needs the youth. The Socialist Party itself CANNOT win the youth. It does not have machinery to do that and it is not an organization of youth. Only Youth Can Win Over the Youth. Let this be very clear!

The YPSL as a political organization can bring into reality what has been said so often by so many Socialists—"The Youth are the hope of Socialism." But the YPSL as a cultural group, firmly under the thumb of the Party Locals, stripped of inner-democracy, its national organization made unnecessary, its officers bound by every Party whim, but its membership only vaguely sympathetic to Socialism to our Party—such a YPSL will be an excuse for youth work. It will not be able to compete with the Communists, the liberals, the conservatives, the reactionaries. The others will have more life and vigor and be more sensitive to the political tendencies and gropings of the young men and women of America.

Our movement is in danger!

The right wing wants to destroy the YPSL as a political youth organization, because the YPSL is a protector of the Left-

wing, a force for the development of our Party into a clear revolutionary Party; and a source of new leadership and material trained and tried, for the left wing Party forces.

"KILL IT BEFORE IT KILLS US" is the cry of the right wing. But the YPSL will never kill the right wing.. If allowed to grow and flourish it will contribute to the change of our Party from a groping hodge-podge to a clear force for Socialism in Our Time. Of course, those who will seek to destroy every advance by disruption and slander, must be eliminated from the ranks of the organized Socialist movement.

Socialists who take their movement seriously must come to the support of the Yipsels. The question is clear—a political youth organization which will be a constant source of energy, freshness, vigor and courage; or a YPSL which will afford cultural, recreational and educational opportunities for its members, errand boys for the Party and will refrain from "interfering" with the Party which some people look upon as their personal property.

The Franco-Soviet Alliance and the World Proletariat

By Harold Draper

IT IS well known, by now, that since the Franco-Soviet Pact the Comintern and its sections have openly taken the stand that they will support war by an imperialist government where the government is fighting on the same side as the Soviet Union —i.e. against Hitler Germany or Japan; and that so long as this line-up remains, they will not attempt to overthrow that imperialist government through revolution. In the words of the editor of the **Daily Worker**:

> "At the outset of the war and in so far as France really fights alongside the Soviet Union, we are not going to call for the defeat of the country that is helping us." (Hathaway, **Daily Worker**, July 6.)

It is likewise well known that the C. I.'s explanation runs as follows: The Franco-Soviet Pact is a force for peace. Anything that delays the coming of war (which must however be admitted to be inevitable under capitalism) is in the interests of the Soviet Union, and **ipso facto**, of the world proletariat. The Franco-Soviet Pact must therefore be supported by the French workers. Of course this means that when war does come they must support that war; but although it may be true that the French government will fight Germany for its own imperialist interests, yet the by-product of its action (defense of the USSR) is **objectively** desirable and beneficial to the working class, and it is therefore that we support the war.

The **Socialist Appeal** and the **Socialist Call** have already pointed out that this "justification" is the same as that of the social-patriots of 1914. One need ony point to the Serbian question in the World War: Serbia was one of the national states of the Austrian Empire, fighting a national-revolutionary war against Austria. Everyone knows that it is as incumbent on revolutionaries to support national-revolutionary wars as proletarian struggles. And Russia entered the war, she said, to help the Slav peoples to freedom. Although her real reason was her own imperialist aims, Russia was **objectively** working for the liberation of Serbia. Was Lenin therefore wrong in working for the defeat of Russia?

So today: war by France on Germany may objectively aid the USSR, but as far as the French working class is concerned, their government is carrying on an imperialist war, and they cannot support it. And since support of the Franco-Soviet pact entails support of France's war against Germany, they cannot support that either, **even if it is otherwise of aid to the Soviet Union.**

This is the fundamental criticism. But apart from this basic consideration—IS IT TRUE THAT THE FRANCO-SOVIET PACT IS IN THE INTERESTS OF THE SOVIET UNION?

1. **The Franco-Soviet military alliance does NOT make for peace**, as the Communists claim. (The Communists, indeed, claim more than this. They have actually asserted that the Pact **guarantees peace!**—See Duclos in **L'Humanitè**, central organ of the French C. P., June 21.)

But when France and the USSR declare their alliance against German aggression, the situation is not eased but only made tense. Germany does not cease to be impelled toward war by the international forces of fascist capitalism, but it is spurred to still greater armaments and militarization. In reaction to one alliance, counter-alliances are crystallized. Since the Pact, England has been pushed closer to Germany (cf. the air treaty), and a sharp swing in Japanese opinion in the direction of Germany has been reported. **Nothing is pacified. The lines of war are merely clearly drawn. All existing antagonisms are jacked up a notch.** When war does come, it is bigger and better.

This process is nothing new. **Fay's Origins of the World War** traces it in detail. The Communists point to the defensive character of the Franco-Soviet Alliance as distinguishing it from the pre-war variety: this means nothing except to clear the Soviet Union of suspicion of aggressive or imperialist designs, if this is necessary. The Pact is no less a part of the lining up of the Powers for the next war.

But more important even is the fact that **the Franco-Soviet Pact removes the biggest obstacle to the provocation of war:** the fear of the war-makers that the declaration of war will unleash revolution or, at least, internal struggles. As far back as 1909, Kautsky gave this as the reason why the war he saw brewing had not yet broken out.

> "Long ago this situation would have led to war.... had it not been for the fact that this alternative would have brought the revolution that stands behind the war—nearer than even behind an armed peace. It is the rising power of the proletariat which for three decades has prevented every European war, and which today causes every European government to shudder at the prospect of war. But forces are driving us on to a condition where at last the weapons will be automatically released." **(Road to Power**, pp. 111-112.)

And indeed, the memoirs of German statesmen show that their anxiety before the war was not to see whether the Social-Democrats were in favor of peace, but to make sure what they would do **once war was declared.**

The Franco-Soviet Pact means that the menace of internal disturbance—the main obstacle to war—is removed (as far as the Communists are concerned). The boldness and provocativeness of the French imperialists then depends only on the strength of their enemy without, not within.

And it is this pact that is hailed as a step toward—nay, a "guarantee" of—peace!

II. But let us probe all the possibilities. Suppose the Pact **did** delay war (it is not worthwhile here refuting the view that it cannot guarantee the end of war): The Communists argue that even if the pact means a breathing-space of only a month, or a year, or two years, it is worth supporting; for then the Soviet Union has so much more time to grow strong. Certainly, if this were the only result of the Pact, there could be no criticism. But to sacrifice the opportunity for proletarian revolution that imperialist war offers—to sell the workers into the service of imperialism—for the sake of one month, or one year or one decade of the Second Five-Year Plan is—rather a bad bargain.

The question is squarely posed: Which is of greater value to the USSR—a breathing space, or the existence of a revolutionary menace behind the lines of the capitalist nations? What should a Socialist state rely on—national self-sufficiency, or the revolutionary workers of the world? Hitherto, the Communists have claimed that these two are not **mutually exclusive**, but rather complementary. This should be so, but the Franco-Soviet Pact drives a wedge between the two, and forces the Comintern to choose—the first. The Soviet Union thereby sacrifices its ultimate interests to its temporary interests.

Lenin defined opportunism as the sacrificing of "the fundamental interests of the masses" to the temporary interests of a minority of the workers. This is what the German Social-Democrats did on August 4, 1914: it would have been impossible for them to fight the war without seeing the magnificent structure which they had so laboriously built up within capitalism go to smash—their labor institutions, unions, banks, cooperatives, the whole labor bureaucracy.... This constituted for the Social-

Democrats a **vested interest** which they had to preserve at all costs, since to them it represented the nucleus around which the future Socialist society would gradually grow. (So, being opportunists, they saved their Socialist-society-within-capitalism, and these same opportunist policies made it possible for a Hitler to smash their little world anyway, later. Truly, reformism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction.)

"The more things change, the more they are the same," said a French wit, (some time before the Franco-Soviet Pact). Opportunism may change its form, and call itself by the horrendous name of Communism, but it remains the same. For behold! the Communist International also has its vested interest, called the Soviet Union, and it is as willing as the next to sacrifice the "fundamental interests of the masses" to the **temporary, short-range**, and therefore false interests of a minority.

Does this mean that the Third International is following in the footsteps of the Second? No. Everybody knows that Communists work with a quicker tempo then reformists. The Second International held congresses at Stuttgart and Basle at which it sent out clarion calls to the workers of the world to warn them against the approaching imperialist war. Even the despised German Social-Democrats vigorously opposed war until its very declaration. It took them until August 4 to come around to social-patriotism and betrayal.

The Comintern is more honest. It scorns to deceive the workers so long.

"FASCISM" IN TERRE HAUTE

by Lydia Beidel

THE WORKING-CLASS movement is an international whole. The saddest proof of this theory is the agility with which the various national sections adopt each other's false ideas and immature concepts. If this weakness were balanced by an equal adeptness in learning the lessons of theoretical and tactical error, things might be much better with the revolutionary socialist movement today.

Remote as it may seem, geographically and politically, from Berlin, Paris, or Moscow, Terre Haute, Indiana brings up the present rear in the procession of error in revolutionary theory as it is expressed by some of our Socialist party members.

For almost two months Terre Haute and Vigo County Indiana, have suffered under a form of martial law. A general strike of short duration declared in the last week of July was offered by Governor McNutt as the excuse for a partial suspension of civil authority and the bringing in of troops. Picketing is prohibited and the general meeting-together of workers forbidden, except when such meetings occur under A. F. of L. auspices. Strike-breakers for the Columbia Enameling Works transact their business under sanction of a pass signed jointly by the vice-president of the Enameling Company and the commanding officer of the Indiana National Guard. Men arrested by the National Guard are held incommunicado for weeks; the right of habeas corpus is suspended. All of which leads many of our American Socialist party members dangerously far along a path strewn with the bleeding bodies and corpses of other Socialist parties of the world.

What do conditions in Terre Haute signify? Terre Haute does not stand alone as a single peak of organized mass action against economic oppression. It has some very significant predecessors — Minneapolis, Toledo, San Francisco. To view any of these upheavals as isolated "accidental" instances or rebellion is to fail to see the profound change through which American labor is going. Each of these is a dramatic manifestation of the slow development of strike strategy to a new and higher level. The decomposition of the capitalist producing machine (of which enhanced monopoly is a part) is making more and more ineffective the strike against the single industrial enterprise. Only two alternatives offer themselves: the general "horizontal" tie-up of an industry (which presupposes a growth of industrial unionism); or the general strike, paralyzing the functioning of a highly interdependent geographic area.

As the decay of capitalism proceeds, the use of the general strike tactic will become ever more necessary and frequent. Coincident with this broadening of strike strategy will come the increasingly more brazen and ruthless use of governmental force on the side of capital. Each of these developments finds its source in the immutable logic of capitalist economic evolution; it is capitalist economy and not the presence of a peculiarly constituted political superstructure that is the root cause of working class misery. One political set-up as against another might add a few embellishments on the side of capitalism, but the prime mover of repressive force against workers is the capitalist producing apparatus.

In the minds of some of our comrades, martial law in Terre Haute falls, together with the NRA, low wages on relief projects, the cutting down of educational budgets and a hundred other things, into the category of American fascism. According to one party member, Governor McNutt himself declared that he has instituted a fascist dictatorship in Vigo County; and because Governor McNutt knows just nothing at all about the theoretical basic characteristics of fascism, we are not obligated to echo his words. Our comrades have found an "illegal" use of martial law; is our logical position therefore to strive to cleanse martial law of its "illegality"? "The whole thing is unconstitutional anyhow". Fight martial law on this basis and the next time Governor McNutt will give you a thoroughly constitutional martial law — and the constitutional clubs will crack just as loudly on workers' skulls and the constitutional bullets kill just as dead.

The declaration of any form of martial law is a move of the capitalist state machine against the working class. "Unconstitutional" or otherwise, it is a vicious assault upon the workers' interests. Terre Haute workers must be swung into a fight against martial law knowing that they are faced with a normal expression of capitalist class rule at a given intensity of struggle. To fight on the basis of legality is in essence to assist capitalism in making its future onslaughts fool-proof; and it diverts to a superficial technicality the attention which the workers should have directed to the fundamentals of the class nature of the state. But most vicious of all, such a campaign throws the reliance of the working class upon the "liberal" phases of the bourgeois constitution instead of upon their own organized resistance.

The state and its troops have allied themselves with the capitalist owners of industry; witness the famous pass issued to the strike-breakers; this is fascism, cry some socialists. Can anyone dig up a single strike of major importance in the history of American industry where this has not happened? Have we all forgotten Ludlow and Homestead, fruit of the heyday of capitalist democracy? Has everyone forgotten that parties were declared illegal and men—hundreds of them—held incommunicado by Attorney-General Palmer in 1919, long before even Mussolini began to do much about fascism? The fact that the Terre Haute A. F. of L. is allowed to sponsor huge open-air mass meetings on the steps of the court-house is not only an indication of the questionable working class virtues of that respectable body but also a pretty certain mark of an ordinary non-fascist capitalist behavior on the part of the governor.

The things taking place in Terre Haute are not happening because the administration of the state of Indiana has broken with burgeois democracy and gone fascist in one county. If the administration uses some of the methods of fascism (but leaves undone some much more important things that a fascist regime should do) that does not excuse us for raising the confusing "wolf"-cry of "fascist dictatorship" against it. These acts are the flower of **Capitalism**—the plain, everyday, garden variety; and compared with Ludlow and Homestead and Minneapolis and San Francisco, weeds of a mild odor. Violence comes out of capitalism just as fascism develops from capitalism; the working class must fight terror in Terre Haute today as a manifestation of an existing capitalist economy and not as the threat of something bad lurking in the dark future.

But is it mere pedantic quibbling to denounce as a very costly sport this loud labeling of the obviously common functional manifestations of a capitalist state machine as fascism? The number of German and Austrian proletarian lives that have paid the price of this sport is well up in the thousands. The Communist party of Germany found full-blown fascism in every administration preceding Hitler—nay, it found it even in the ranks of the Social-Democratic and Communist Labor parties. So many of the ordinary things of life were fascism that the masses of workers found themselves quite unmoved to take arms against the arch-fascist, Hitler. And the revolutionary workers themselves, whose first duty to the movement is intellectual clarity and scientific accuracy, were confused and stupified by a slip-shod irresponsible leadership. You cannot destroy an enemy if you do not know of what he is made nor where he is.

This simple and hysterical crying of "Fascism, fascism" has a corollary still more dangerous to the revolutionary socialist movement. That consists in diverting all of the energies of the party membership and sympathetic masses into the channel of a defensive struggle against a threatening condition without recognizing that the best defense against that menace is a strong offensive against capitalism in its every manifestation. The germs of fascism lie in capitalist breakdown; fascism can be prevented only if the revolutionary socialist party takes advantage of that breakdown to strike blow after blow at the body of capitalism itself, destroying the germ with the bearer.

We can look to Germany again for lessons in defensism and its outcome. For how many years and how desperately did German Social-Democracy "defend" the Weimar Constitution against "the fascist menace?" But they failed to organize the offensive for socialism and now they are still on the defensive—behind the walls of concentration camps.

But if we want a still more tragic manifestation of defensism and its final implications, we may look to our erstwhile critics, the Communist International. Completely abandoning the principle that the irreconcilable enemy of socialism is the capitalist state machine, we see these "communists" (motivated by a weak,, non-revolutionary defensism) going the length of distinguishing between good and bad capitalism, good and bad imperialist wars, even bad and not-so-bad fascisms! And, mind you, asking the revolutionary masses to line up on the "good" sides, if they are not too dizzy to know which is which. It may be Comintern "dialectics" to conceive of good enemies and bad enemies, but it is sheer betrayal in the mind of any revolutionary socialist.

The height of confusion is found, however, in the new line of the Communist party of France, which now busies itself fighting fascism by "people's front" alliances with potentially fascist elements in France to prevent fascism from arriving in the form of a Nazi army from Germany. The seeds of French fascism lie in France and not in Germany and the only real defense against German imperialist aggression is the destruction of French imperialism through the socialist revolution. To make a truce with French imperialism means to act as midwife at the birth of French fascism. This is the ultimate logic of the purely defensive fight against fascism.

The present struggle in Terre Haute will not be the last one of its kind upon which the Socialist party will have to take a position. That position should be taken upon the basic socialist principle that the struggle for socialism is conducted against capitalism as **capitalism**, regardless of its manifestation under a democratic republic or a fascist dictatorship. The new Comintern line which expresses the distinction between bourgeois democracies and fascist dictatorships in the form of truces and alliances with the former in the field of the class struggle is suicidal for the cause of the socialist revolution. Those ideologically bent in the direction of compromise with ordinary pre-fascist capitalism are precisely the ones guilty of the careless terming of every violent expression of capitalist rule as fascism. Whether motivated by cowardice or a spirit of compromise or an inability to understand the forces with which they must deal, these people refuse to come to grips with capitalism as a whole and single out only its crassest evils for attack, branding these not as normal expressions of capitalism but as something else that has a bad name.

Revolutionary socialists will have to work hard to stop the spread of the idea that there are good and also bad capitalisms. Capitalism in all its forms is diametrically opposed to socialism; some people are forgetting that fact very rapidly. Those who are still undemoralized, those who still have the virility to fight an offensive battle against capitalism, economically and politically, on the basis of socialist principle will have to be drawn together. It is the historical function of revolutionary socialists today to gather together and build into a strong organization those whose opposition to capitalism is a matter of basic principle and not simply emotional reaction.

ETHIOPIA **(Continued from page 2)**

seems to be to ask the imperialists to surrender their imperialist rights. Whereas the attitude of revolutionary socialists is to struggle for the defeat of their own imperialist government.

It must be made exceedingly clear that in fighting against the Italian imperialists we are fighting for the interests of the Italian working class. The cause of the Italian workers is very dear to us and we shall do all in our power to help them free themselves from slavery of fascism and capitalism. The defeat of Mussolini is a victory for the Italian workers.

And it must be made just as clear that we are not at all interested in the King of Kings and the Conquering Lion of Judah. How shameful and disgraceful is the attitude of the Communists toward that slave owner and defender of the feudal lords. They act as if that slave driver represents the interests of the Ethiopian peasants and slaves. We defend the Ethiopian people against the imperialist designs of Italy but we are not at all interested in seeing that Haile Selassie remains as the ruler of an exploited people.

Revolutionary socialists in contradistinction to reformists and Stalinists will say clearly: WE ARE AGAINST THE GOVERNNEMENT OF MUSSOLINI BUT WE ARE ALSO AGAINST OUR OWN IMPERIALIST GOVERNMENTS AND THAT FIRST OF ALL.

SUBSCRIBE FOR

SOCIALIST APPEAL

RUDOLPH C. OLSON

Business Manager

4219 LINCOLN AVE. CHICAGO, ILL.

Subscription: 50 cents 12 issues—25 cents 6 issues

Apologia

The publishers regret the condition of the following number (Volume 2/#2). After unsuccessfully attempting to locate a perfect copy in every major collection in the United States, we finally settled for the fragments reprinted on the following eight pages, in favor of not reprinting the issue at all.

Although some text is missing, the context of the various articles is for the most part clear. If any library has a perfect copy of this number, we would appreciate their bringing it to our attention so that it can be reproduced and sent as a replacement to those libraries who have purchased this imperfect copy.

—The Publishers

FROM OUR VIEWPOINT

Old Guard Defies Decision of N.E.C.

THE New York old guard came to the last N. E. C. meeting with the request that the N. E. C. cancel the debate between Norman Thomas and Earl Browder arranged by the Socialist Call. The N. E. C. refused.

Every thinking Socialist understands the necessity of defending the viewpoint of the Socialist party against all other parties. Under no circumstances can we afford to refuse to debate any party with a substantial following. The Old Guard, composed of people who are unable to think at all when it comes to the question of communism, plays into the hands of the communists by refusing to defend its point of view.

Most important of all, however, is the fact that the debate is held under the auspices of the Socialist Call. The old guard, determined to put the Call out of existence, seized upon the debate as a pretext to expel or suspend leading elements of the Militants.

Charges have been preferred against Norman Thomas, Jack Altman, Max Delson and other Militants for promoting the debate. Since the N. E. C. approved of the debate these charges constitute a violation of discipline by the New York old guard.

It is obvious that the New York right wing is determined to suspend or expel leading Militants and thus precipitate a split in the party. The debate will go on regardless of the action of the old guard. What will the old guard do?

The left-wing throughout the country must be prepared to meet the situation. It must back up any Militant suspended or expelled with all the forces at its disposal. The right wing moves to split, the left wing must move to unify the party.

ATONEMENT BY THE N.E.C.

IT IS in the nature of the present National Executive Committee of our party not to be able to act decisively and consistently for a long period of time. There is no majority representing any definite tendency and consequently the actions of our N.E.C. have a contradictory character just as the resolutions of the N.E.C. on almost all important matters are full of contradictions aiming, as they invariably do, to please every tendency in the party.

A legitimate and praiseworthy desire to achieve harmony thin the party leads the N.E.C. to favor the right wing at one time and the left at another time. This middle of the road path does not and cannot solve any problems and simply means that the party not only cannot grow but must actually lose members and influence. And as a matter of fact the party has lost over 6000 members within the last two years. A weak and indecisive N.E.C. is unable to lead the party in any direction.

Hope surged high in the breasts of many influential party mbers after the "peace pact" between the N.E.C. and the old d. Now we could work and grow. Those of the left wing openly stated that no problems were solved by the agreement consequently the party could not proceed to function, ally since the old guard had come out with all it wanted he agreement, were looked upon as born disrupters but ave confirmed the prognosis of the revolutionary Marxists of the optimistic utopians.

e stated here that in any struggle between two ten- the Socialist party there can be peace only by adhering wing two propositions: 1) that the minority doe cisions and actions of the majority;

old guard utilized every unfair means to prevent the minority of New York to present its viewpoint and achieve power in a normal manner the division between the two groups could not be reconciled on the basis of a minority obeying discipline. There can be no discipline if the minority is not permitted full freedom.

It is the desire of the old guard of New York to crush the growth of revolutionary ideas and it does not hesitate to use any means to achieve that aim. Consequently there can be no peace so long as these right-wing tactics continue. The attempt of the N.E.C. to achieve peace was doomed to failure.

The majority of the N.E.C. realized that it had made a mistake by giving in to the old guard at the New York session. No peace had been consummated in New York and the party was not growing as predicted. The old guard was using the pact to exterminate the ideas of revolutionary socialism. If the majority of the N.E.C. had to be convinced of the fact that the growth of the party depends not upon the old guard but upon the virile left wing forces the trend of events subsequent to the pact should have convinced it.

With the failure to achieve peace in New York and the obvious failure of the party to go forward as a background, the N.E.C. met in Chicago and the general tendency of the meeting was an attempt to undo the damage wrought at the New York meeting of the N.E.C. A turn towards the left wing was made but again in such an indecisive manner that it cannot possibly satisfy either the right or the left.

Actually nothing that was done by the N. E. C. can be characterized as left wing. That could not be expected from the very nature of the composition of the majority of the N.E.C. The best that can be said is that the N.E.C. did not do what the old guard wanted it to do. It did not prohibit the Thomas-Browder debate; it did not reelect James Oneal as delegate to the International; it did not place the New York Yipsels under the domination of the old guard; it did not pass a resolution of war favoring sanctions. This and this only was the extent of the concession to the left wing.

Obviously the left wing prefers the N.E.C. to do what it did at its last meeting to what it accomplished at the New York meeting. But it would be a colossal act of self-delusion to act on the assumption that from now on the N.E.C. has turned to the left. The left wing of the party, now being hammered into a unified group by the Boundbrook conference and the mid-west conference, should and does realize clearly that without an N.E.C., the majority of the members of which are revolutionary socialists, the party cannot grow.

But to achieve an N.E.C. with a majority of revolutionary socialists it is first of all necessary to educate the membership so that a majority of the party will be willing to struggle and support revolutionary policies. To educate and guide such a majority is the task of the left wing.

PROGRESSIVES AND THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION

THE TOP leadership of the bureaucratic machine has been in control of the American Federation of Labor so long and so completely that it was taken for granted by everyone that a convention of the A. F. of L. would simply rubber-stamp everything that the Executive Council proposed. A real struggle on some fundamental principle was almost inconceivable and the most that one could expect in the way of opposition was some lone wolf crying in the wilderness.

As a consequence the really bitter struggle that took place at the last convention held at Atlantic City and the shaking which the controlling element of the Federation machine was jected to electrified the whole movement [illegible] expressive to

is a grave danger lest, in the anxiety of some pro-
rade-unionists to bring about a change of leadership
ics, bureaucrats of the type of John L. Lewis and Sidney
man would be pushed forward as the great "white hopes" of
e militant elements of the trade union movement.

It would be absurd to deny that the last convention showed a
ignificant trend forward. The mere fact that an open struggle
occurred on the floor of the convention between two elements in
the leadership of the trade unions is in itself a progressive factor.
A struggle amongst conservative leaders always affords the pro-
gressives a better opportunity to spread their ideas. To disregard
the struggle of Lewis against Hutcheson and Frey on behalf of
industrial unionism and to consider it simply as a struggle be-
tween two factions of the machine for power is to disregard the
tremendous forces at work within the labor movement at the
present time—forces which, in the last analysis, explain the bit-
terness of the fight.

The prolonged depression, the steady displacement of skilled
by unskilled labor by virtue of the development of new machinery,
the spasmodic improvement in economy, the National Recovery
Act—all these factors have brought into the unions thousands
and tens of thousands of new, and mainly unskilled, working class
elements. It was the policy of the dominant leadership of the
A. F. of L. in relying upon the government rather than upon
the strength of labor which largely retarded the growth of the
unions. It is because of the short-sighted and reactionary craft
union leadership that the workers in the mass production in-
dustries are at the present moment almost wholly unorganized.

The leaders of those international unions that are based upon
great numbers of unskilled workers recognize the danger facing
them if the workers in such basic industries as steel, rubber and
automobiles are left unorganized. They correctly see in the
policies of the dominant elements of the Federation a danger to
their own positions and they are determined to make a serious
attempt to destroy the influence of Woll, Hutcheson, Frey and
the others.

In so far as Lewis and his supporters are struggling against
an antiquated craft unionism which is one of the main factors
responsible for the failure to organize the basic sections of the
American workers, the progressive trade unionists must not and
cannot refuse to throw their influence on the side of Lewis.
Militant trade-unionists would place themselves in a ridiculous
position if they were to refuse to support a resolution in favor of
ndustrial unionism simply because Lewis was the one who in-
troduced and defended it.

But to look to Lewis or Hillman to lead the American trade
union movement into progressive channels is to fool oneself and
to fool everyone else. The past record of an individual is not
to be held against him provided he changes his tactics and openly
admits his mistakes. The role which Lewis has played in the
labor movement in general and in the United Mine Workers in
particular should make us hesitate to look upon him as a leader
of the progressives even if he would proclaim to the world that
he has now different ideas about running a union. And since
there is no indication that he has changed his ideas and tactics
it would constitute a betrayal of the interests of the American
workers to picture Lewis as the one who will lead the American
trade union movement into the path of the class struggle.

Concretely what should be the task of a group of progressive
unionists in the United Mine Workers? Should they cease to
struggle against Lewis for his suppression of the democratic
rights of the miners in their union? Should a progressive group
keep quiet about his class collaboration policy? Such a group
would be looked upon with contempt by every class conscious
miner who, out of bitter experience, knows the type of man
Lewis really is.

The secret of correct tactics in the struggle for progressive
unionism is the organization of true progressives on a definite
program and of the independent activity of the progressives with
reference to every problem and every leader. To support a trade
union leader at one time on a certain policy or to make a block
him is perfectly correct even though that leader will have to
ught on different oc ns. But to make a permanent al-
on le essentially, far from being
are , easily just
as Green and Woll. One should not forget
unions they are capable of using gangsters an
every form of progressive opposition. If one
ties one is not in a position to play the role
socialists should play in the trade union movemen

Objectively, to-day Lewis is playing a progressiv
American Federation of Labor, and therefore the intere
progressivism, as well as of the working class as a whole, re
quire that we co-operate with Lewis, as well as with other forces
who support a progressive program. But it would be false
strategy to fuse with Lewis, to forget the differences which
still exist, to fail to criticize when he hesitates or vacillates, to
refuse to put forward correct demands out of fear that he might
not accept them. Neither capitulation to Green nor to Lewis, but
constant, and fearless progressive activity will build the kind of
labor movement we want.

SOCIALISTS IN THE TEACHERS' UNION

AT TIMES it seems possible to keep the factional struggle within the party from interfering with the work of the party members in trade unions and other mass organizations. It would appear that within the party we can assail one another on some questions involving the principles of socialism and work harmoniously in organizations outside of the party. The situation in the Teachers' union and in several other unions shows conclusively that when a deep gulf in principle separates one group of socialists from another it is utopian to expect to be able to keep the conflict between the two groups away from the non-party organizations.

A controversy involving fundamental principles must sooner or later be transferred to tactics involving every day activities. The conception of socialism which the right wing has, necessarily involves a close working agreement with the bureaucrats of the labor movement. The right wing wants to and does adapt itself to the conservative wishes of a conservative labor bureaucracy. It has no desire to organize the working masses for any militant struggles for better conditions regardless of the wishes of the top leadership of the American Federation of Labor. In any struggle of any militant group against the labor bureaucrats the right wing of the party will inevitably be found on the side of the burocrats.

Needless to say the left wing of the Socialist party must use different tactics within the trade unions. Upholding the principles of revolutionary socialism, left wingers within the unions cannot and must not be servants of the labor bureaucracy. Their task is to organize the militant and progressive forces of the unions and wage a struggle for militant unionism which must inevitably bring them into conflict with the top leaders. To act in any other manner would be to cease being revolutionary socialists.

James Oneal and those who agree with his theories of socialism contend that the Socialist party must not interfere in the internal affairs of the trade unions. But their theory of no interference is an utter sham. What they mean is that no socialists should conduct a struggle against the labor bureaucra The right wing always interferes but on the side of the conservative leaders.

It is the duty of members of the Socialist party working in the same union to organize themselves and, together with al progressive and militant forces, strive to make of the union progressive, democratic organization. Of course the bureaucrs will howl that the Socialists are interfering in the internal aff of the union but let them howl. We are not and should n interested in what they say but in what the militant ran file thinks and in the welfare of the union.

Only revolutionary Socialists will fight for the interests workers and their organizations. Consequently they prepared to have right wing Socialists make an alliance labor bureaucrats against them. So be it! We mu one moment hesitate to struggle in the unions becau wing members of the Socialist party sympathize w of the conservative union bureaucracy. bers of the Socialist party fighting a

...in New York w... ...ing in its opposition to dual union ...icies. Within the last few months, several incidents have occurred that have lined it up against certain A. F. of L. locals. Not only has it changed a policy, (that is no crime), but it has done so in order to back up members of the party who have either deliberately split a union, (Teacher's Union), or have been accused of racketeering and forced out by the A. F. of L. (Nemser).

We have no desire to indict Nemser in these pages. Whether or not he is guilty of the charges preferred against him is no longer the main issue. What is important is the position adopted by the Old Guard and the New Leader as events unravelled.

Briefly, the history of the affair is as follows: Nemser, who was once before in difficulty because of dual union tactics in the Amalgamated, was counsel for, and manager of, local 107 and 717 of the Retail Clothing Salesmen's Union. Early in the summer the public press printed a series of articles exposing a suspicious relationship between Nemser and one Silverman of a bosses' association. Both were accused for racketeering in collusion on the workers in the industry, and on the owners of retail stores. The situation became so bad that William Collins, local representative of the A. F. of L. asked for the union books so that he might investigate the matter. When the officials of the union refused to turn over the books to him unless they were first guaranteed immunity, the charters of the locals were revoked. In the meanwhile the international Association disclosed that it had not received dues in accordance with the alleged membership of the union.

The locals were then reorganized and a new charter issued. Through all this the Old Guard supported Nemser wholeheartedly. Instead of using its influence with important leaders of the trade unions in N. Y., members of the S. P., to the end that a labor committee should be appointed to investigate the accusations, it preferred charges against Eddie Levenson, a militant, who had exposed the set-up.

Then came one of the most amazing chapters in the S. P. trade union history. In the course of its organization work, the newly chartered local, 1006, struck one of the largest stores in the city. Nemser's remnant of the outlawed "union" supplied the scabs. While the legitimate pickets paraded in front of the premises they were rivalled by members of the Young Socialist Alliance (Local New York's official "youth movement") who carried signs alleging that there was no strike in the store. Both groups then resorted to street meetings.

In persuance of Local N. Y.'s professed policy of neutrality (sic) in the situation August Claessens, N. Y. Labor Secretary, spoke from the platform of the outlawed "union." Word of this spread like wildfire. A wave of disgust spread over the city. Murray Baron, a member of the National Labor Committee was called upon by the A.F. of L. union, and spoke in the capacity of a trade unionist, in the hope that the S. P. would not be com-...discredited.

Subsequently the strike was settled and an amalgan... ...fected on condition that Nemser step out of the picture. ... pressure from the legitimate elements Nemser was forced o...

Why did the right wing in New York back a legitimate A. ... of L. union and support a shady dual union? For factional ... asons? Nemser, a member of the New York Central Commit... votes with the right wing on every issue. Possibly for oth... reasons?

Factionalism once more precipitated the Old Guard into a... impossible position in the Teachers' Union. Again we need no... concern ourselves with the merits of the contending sides within the union. If, as the Linville-Lefkowitz group asserts the Communists in the N. Y. local of the American Federation of Teachers were obstructive and undisciplined, then they should have been dealt with in accordance with the usual democratic processes provided for in the constitution and by-laws of the union. It was entirely indefensible to demand that a substantial part of the local, well over one-third of the membership, be ousted because it disagreed with the leadership. Defeated in its attempt at the convention to split the local by official action, and due to pleas advanced by the left socialists and other progressive groups within the union, to remain and fight its battle, the Linville-Lefkowitz group, with the backing of the Old Guard leadership, resigned. They then organized a dual union.

Their hope, of course, was to receive the support of the Central Trades of New York and of the A. F. of L. convention. This hope proved abortive, when Mulholland, vice-president of the N. Y. Central Trades, sharply criticized the right wing position of support for splitting tactics. The union today is as strong as it was before the defections. The attitude of the splitters was such as to galvanize the sentiment of people who had hitherto been only passive supporters of the union, resulting in a large number of new applications for admission. Although not in agreement with the Communists in the Teachers' Union, left wing Socialists fought well against disruption and split.

The objectives of the Old Guard stand out clearly. It determined to discredit the left wing socialists in the union led by Maynard Krueger. It hoped to curry favor with the top leadership of the A. F. of L. on the spurious "communist" issue. Recent articles in the Jewish Daily Forward and the New Leader confirmed the suspicion that the Old Guard in New York ... not intend to support the progressive forces in the labor movement, but instead, will play its cards with the Green-Woll group. It is impossible to find any guiding principle for the Old Guard labor position, unless it be that it will oppose anyone whom members of the left wing can work with; or else that it will support the present leadership in the unions regardless of what it may stand for.

The policy of the left wing in the union: FOR PROGRESSIVISM WHETHER IT BE WITH OR AGAINST THE UNION LEADERS.

Socialists and Attack of Italy Upon Ethiopia

By Albert Goldman

IN THE last issue of the Appeal there was an editorial dealing with a proclamation of the National Executive Committee calling for the defense of Ethiopia. That proclamation was issued prior to the October meeting of the NEC. At that meeting the NEC adopted a resolution on war which is certainly a vast improvement over the proclamation. Nevertheless it is not a resolution which revolutionary socialists can support whole-heartedly. The proclamation on the war question adopted by the NEC of the Young People's Socialist League is one which we can support as against the resolution of the party NEC. This does not mean that the YPSL proclamation is without errors but in essence it states the revolutionary socialist position on the Italian-Ethiopian conflict and is much clearer and superior to the resolution of the party NEC.

* * * *

The attack of It... ...Ethiopia brought the problem of the ... of socia... ...down from an abstract theoretical ... ...e. It is now a ...estion of ar... actual conflict and the position that we must take toward conflict and not simply a question of our attitude to a war in the future. An agreement can be arrived much difficulty on a resolution dealing with a abstract but differences become very sharp with the necessity of applying general p... situation.

Pacifism, Dominant Note of Pa...

The party resolution is a lengthy or... sarily bad. It is bad in this case bec... primarily of a desire to please ever... general and against the Italian-Ethic... contains paragraphs and sentences w... are absolutely correct and, on the ... pressed which every revolutionar... reject. The resolution is against t... is a vague reference to the poss... gue of Nations. But they th...

...at it cannot be said to express any one ...manner.

While it is true that expressions can be found to justify ... claim that the party resolution caters to every tendency, it is ...doubtedly correct to state that the prevailing note of the re...ution is a pacifist one. It appeals to all people and to all ...ers of peace. Probably the most characteristic sentence in ...e whole resolution is the last one in the first paragraph. "Nothing less than the maximum effort of the American people, ...sed on the most realistic policies, can prevent their country ...rom being drawn in." One can hardly imagine a more utopian and well-meaning attitude than that reflected by that sentence. To appeal to the deep desire for peace which exists in all sections of the population in order to attract a great number to ...he banner of the Socialist party is a temptation which only those comrades who are grounded in revolutionary Marxism can ...ithstand. To give expression to beautiful sentiments for international peace and good will is indeed simple but exceedingly dangerous. It throws the struggle against war off from the ...ils of the class struggle and in effect lends assistance to the ...cialists. No further proof should be necessary than the ...t that th... eleven million pacifist votes recently obtained in ...gland on behalf of the Le...ue of Nations, actually serves to ...bilize the masses behind the British imperialists in their ...esent struggle against Italian imperialism. How easy it is for ... capitalist government to convince peace-loving people that they ...must go to war in order to fight for peace.

In contradistinction to the party resolution the Yipsel proclamation breathes the spirit of the class struggle and emphasizes the necessity of organizing the workers to wage such a struggle. The unequivocal statement in the Yipsel proclamation that the chief enemy of the people is at home and that the working class must not, for any reason, declare a truce with the capitalist class, during war or peace, makes of the proclamation, in spite of its defects, a revolutionary one.

Defense of Ethiopia

Three major problems are involved in any discussion on the ...uestion of the attitude of the Socialist party to the Italian attack on Ethiopia. They are: 1) the question of defending the independence of Ethiopia; 2) the question of sanctions by the imperialist governments; 3) the question of fighting for neutrality legislation. We shall leave out the question of supporting ...mocratic capitalist states in a war against a fascist state because it is a more general and also a more indirect question as far as the problem of the Italian attack is concerned and because it requires more extensive treatment.

It is indeed surprising to what an extent comrades with revolutionary tendencies will object to the idea of defending Ethiopia against Italian imperialism. What has thrown them off the track is the fact that Great Britain, in order to protect its imperialist interests, has assumed the role of the protector of Ethiopia. But why should we forget Ethiopia entirely just because England has interests contrary to the interests of Italian imperialism? It is not at all excluded that England and Italy might come to some agreement giving part of Ethiopian territory to the latter and that Ethiopia would have to depend upon ... strength exclusively in the struggle against Italy. In ...se there would be no question of Great Britain versus ...r duty to come to the defense of Ethiopia would ...daylight except to some doctrinaire who would ...ything until the day of the proletarian re... ...s of England demand that it struggle ...erests of the revolutionary proletariat de... ...e defense of Ethiopia; from different and ...stile elements are fighting for what ...urpose. It would be the most absurd ...as to assume an indifferent attitude ...ply because the imperialist interests ...t Ethiopia be kept free from Italian ...

...oiling masses in the imperialist ...rial and semi-colonial people of ...mply of being exploited by the ... a bond of sympathy between ...

...dous profits wi... ...exploitation ... to keep its hold upon the working masses of the ...untries. It needs colonies to get rid of its surplus products and to find investments for its accumulated capital. Without colonies to exploit capitalism would be faced with many more and greater difficulties to continue its existence.

The revolutionary interests of the proletariat of the imperialist countries necessitate that the working class come to the aid of all colonial people struggling against imperialism. Every defeat of the imperialists by a colonial people is a victory for the working class. The proletariat therefore must champion the interests of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples not simply out of a vague sympathy but out of consideration of its own class interests. A revolutionary socialist party, representing the interests of the working class, cannot afford to be indifferent to the fate of any colonial people. Every struggle in Asia and Africa against the imperialist robbers must get the whole-hearted support of the Socialist party, especially of the party of that country against which the colonial people is struggling.

In the struggle of Ethiopia against Italy we must raise the slogan of defending the independence of Ethiopia. Otherwise, we shall be taking the side of the imperialists against the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

Both the party and Yipsel resolutions are defective in that they fail to raise that slogan clearly and without equivocation. In the party resolution a vague sympathy for the Ethiopians is expressed without even hinting at the necessity of definitely raising the slogan of defending Ethiopia. The Yipsel proclamation takes a very peculiar attitude to the question of defending Ethiopian independence. In a sublime aloofness it declares that "socialists cannot limit their judgment to a weighing of the wrongs of Italy as against the rights of Ethiopia." In their legitimate desire to emphasize the imperialist rivalries between Great Britain and Italy and the possibilities of an imperialist war arising out of the attack of Italy upon Ethiopia, the Yipsels are willing to forget that at the present moment the actual struggle is against Italian imperialism. What a comfort it must be to the Ethiopian people to know that we are analyzing all the possibilities of an imperialist war and meanwhile preparing only for those possibilities. Nor can it gladden the hearts of the Ethiopians laying down their lives fighting the Italian invasion to know that the Yipsels are in favor of all colonial peoples.

It is a sign of a surrender to opportunism to clothe oneself in high sounding generalities and disregard the necessity of taking definite stand on a concrete problem.

The Yipsel proclamation is absolutely correct in pointing out that Ethiopia must also be defended against British imperialism and that Great Britain is not at all interested in the independence of Ethiopia for any altruistic reasons but that does not relieve us of the responsibility of taking a definite position in favor of Ethiopia as against Italy and of saying so clearly.

Victory of Ethiopia is Defeat Also of Great Britain

But if Ethiopia wins Great Britain wins, argue some comrades. That is taking a short-sighted view of the struggle. Should Ethiopia win, repercussion would undoubtedly occur all over Africa and Asia. The colonial slaves of all imperialist countries would be encouraged to raise the standard of revolt. That is one of the reasons why Great Britain is so anxious to settle the matter without a struggle. Great Britain does not want to see Italy victorious but neither does it want to see the Ethiopians the victors. It fears the effects of such a victory amongst the colonial slaves everywhere. To help the Ethiopians come out victorious in the struggle against Italy is, in the last analysis, to help defeat not only Italy but also Great Britain.

No argument is necessary to support the proposition that should an imperialist war break out in Europe as a result of the Ethiopian conflict the question of the independence of Ethiopia is relegated to the background and the main emphasis must be placed upon the struggle of the working class against their own governments. That does not mean ... cease to suppo... Ethiopian independence but that we ... more clearly ... ever with the proposition that o... a rev...

We are for the independence of Ethiopia against Italy but we are just as much against the capitalist governments who voted for sanctions. Just as in the matter of neutrality legislation, so in the case of defending the independence of Ethiopia, the Socialist party must urge the working class to act independently of the capitalist government. There is this difference. Whereas we do not oppose neutrality legislation, we must actively and fiercely oppose sanctions. We must work for a boycott against Italy, a boycott so effective that it will defeat Italian imperialism. But we must also struggle against being involved in any war on behalf of "our" imperialist government. We must clearly state that no matter what the ostensible reason is, the real reason for any imperialist government in declaring war is to protect the interests of the capitalist class and under no circumstances can we support such a war.

Based on our conception of the necessity of supporting the struggle of Ethiopian independence against Italian imperialism we reject the idea of boycotting both Italy and Ethiopia. Nor can revolutionary socialists accept the absurd idea of permitting food to be shipped for the Italian civil population. That is living in the realm of humanitarian clouds and not in the world of reality. Perhaps our NEC will insist upon sending a committee over to Mussolini for the purpose of supervising the distribution of the food. Perhaps our kind-hearted NEC members will insist that the food be sent to the victims of Mussolini's terror. Perhaps our charitable NEC will insist on labelling the packages "For babies only."

The argument for that brilliant idea seems to be a double-party is not against the [illegible] How that follows is a problem in logic which the NEC see fit to solve. If, on the other hand, Mussolini will stupid as to give the food to the army and the fascists, then the workers will rise in revolt against such perfidious conduct. That this argument will receive the prize both for soft-heartedness and soft-headedness is a fairly safe conclusion.

We want Mussolini defeated and we want the Italian workers to revolt against him and that is what the Italian revolutionists also want. The Italian revolutionists would undoubtedly grind their teeth with rage if they should see food being sent at the request of socialists which food is helping Mussolini stave off defeat. Every socialist will agree that war is a horrible thing but a revolutionary socialist will insist that we have to struggle against it with all the forces at our command and not with humanitarian gestures. The only real and consistent humanitarians are revolutionary Marxists.

The task of a revolutionary socialist is clear: For the defense of Ethiopia against Italian imperialism by independent working class action; against sanctions by any capitalist government; no support of neutrality legislation but a real struggle against the capitalist government to prevent its declaring war; struggle for the proletarian revolution if war is declared in spite of all our efforts.

NOTE: At the last minute we were told that a combination of right wing and centrist elements succeeded in amending the Yipsel resolution on war. We do not know what the amendments consist of but we hope that the Yipsel membership will reject any resolution on war which is not based on the principles outlined in above article.

A. G.

DEEPER AND DEEPER IN THE SWAMP

By Herbert Zam

WITH express-train speed the war policies of the Communist International are unfolding themselves, each unfoldment disclosing more clearly the amazing depths of chauvinism in which the Comintern is now wallowing. After the decision of the Seventh Congress against the mechanical transference of policies from one country to another, one might expect at least an apparent orientation to the conditions in each specific country. Instead, we find the opposite: All the Communist parties, in all the capitalist countries are orientating less to conditions in their own countries, and more and more exclusively are being guided entirely by the policies of the Soviet Union. We pick up Browder's report on the Seventh Congress, for instance, (Daily Worker, Oct. 5, 1935) and find:

"Is it not clear, therefore, that every effort to fight for peace, against fascism, requires in every country that we should take as our basis and starting point the peace policy of the Soviet Union? Is it not clear that every one who rejects or casts doubt upon that peace policy is helping the fascists and war makers?"

Lest we might conclude that this is due to Browder's failure to understand the decision of the Seventh Congress, we turn to another authority, Harry Pollitt, the leader of the British C. P. (Labor Monthly, Oct. 1935) and find almost the same statement:

"....and there is not an honest man or woman in this country who professes to be Socialist who can say to us that at any price and at any cost they are not prepared to defend the Soviet Union, because it is the text of our Socialist faith."

We will not argue here as to what "at any cost" might or might not me[illegible] What we are concerned with is the outlook which is here [illegible] Of the entire class struggle in the entire world [illegible] to these comrades: the Soviet Union. [illegible]ted to that. Furthermore, the defense [illegible] to be carried through along lines [illegible]onditions in each country, but in line [illegible] the Soviet Union itself. That is, [illegible] to remain at peace with the ruling [illegible]ies, which takes specific form in [illegible]ose countries, also becomes the [illegible] the policies of the Communist [illegible] last analysis this means a de[illegible]mmunist Parties (and wh[illegible]ever [illegible]ws them) and the cap[illegible]t [illegible]"

But the policies here enunciated go beyond that. Willingness to defend the Soviet Union, declares Pollitt "is the text of our Socialist faith." Nothing else? We always thought that the ultimate test of Socialist faith is in our attitude toward our own ruling class. Even a "rotten liberal" can favor the defense of the Soviet Union. Aren't there thousands who are ready to stand for the defense of Ethiopia who are not Socialists or Communists? How many more thousands are ready to stand for the defense of the Soviet Union, a workers' country, who are not themselves Socialists or Communists!

That this is not just a bad formulation we see by following the footsteps of Pollitt. In discussing the prospects of economic recovery, he makes the following analysis:

"Whilst at the moment there are certain forces within capitalism which are making for capitalism getting out of the worst phase of the economic crisis, the ordinary forces within capitalism that lead to periodical trade depression are going to meet the forces that are making for recovery much sooner than is realized. Then there will be a renewed struggle for the world market and renewed attacks on the working class in every capitalist country...."

And what should the working class do, one logically asks? Fight back? Make a revolution? Take over power?

"When the situation arises again," continues Pollitt, "then **the defense of the Soviet Union will become the chief paramount consideration of every working man and woman in the capitalist countries...."**

Comment is really superfluous. The working class, according to this, has nothing to fight for on its own behalf. Even in the midst of a crisis, of collapsing capitalism, it has only one duty: "Defend the Soviet Union"!

All we can say to them is: God save the working class from such advice and God save the Soviet Union from such defense!

II.

Another phase of Comintern war policy which is becoming clearer is the question of the defense of [illegible]s. The Seventh Congress declared in favor of [illegible]fo the defense of small nations (in additio[illegible] war of "democratic" against "fasci[illegible] "small nations"? Again we are in[illegible] answer: [illegible]finitely de[illegible]ed at th[illegible]

Lenin's attitude on S[illegible] and Belgium

[illegible]ome reason or other those who oppose the slogan of de[illegible]g the independence of Ethiopia point to Lenin's attitude on the question of Belgium and Serbia during the World War. To use the name of a great revolutionist who, more than anyone else, insisted upon supporting the struggle of colonial peoples against imperialist bandits, in order to avoid the elementary duty of every socialist to support the struggle of the Ethiopians, is to evidence an indescribable confusion. It was not against the idea of the self determination of Belgium and Serbia that Lenin fought but against the policy of the socialists in supporting their own governments on the pretext of fighting for the indepence of the small countries.

And it would be a mistake to compare Belgium and Serbia with Ethiopia. The former countries had a proletariat and socialist parties; Ethiopia has not yet graduated from the feudal system. Capitalism has practically left it untouched. Serbia and Belgium are so interconnected with the European imperialist powers that it is almost impossible to make any valid separation. That is not the case with Ethiopia, the last semi-independent country of the African continent which is totally under the domination of European imperialist countries including Belgium.

Lenin suggests that if Belgium or Serbia had been attacked by a big power and no other factor were involved the socialists would look with sympathy upon the efforts of the bourgeoisie of the smaller countries to guard their national independence. But he simply suggests it as an abstraction and hardly considered it as a possible reality. That Lenin, were he alive to-day, would support the struggle for Ethiopian independence and at the same time fight bitterly against the Communist and Labor and Socialist Internationals for advocating sanctions by the imperialist governments is a conclusion which we are certainly justified in making from his writings and actions.

But is not Haile Selassie the feudal lord and exploiter of the Ethiopian people? And are we not, in defending Ethiopia, actually defending the interests of one exploiter as against another? To consider the matter from this angle means to lose all sense of proportion and to stray far from the realm of Marxism. To a revolutionary socialist the question of supporting a war always revolves around the interests of the proletariat. In the early days of capitalism Marx supported the wars of capitalist nations against feudal powers because they served the interests of the development of the revolutionary proletariat and consequently were progressive. In the epoch of imperialism a Marxist must support a colonial people in its struggle against an imperialist power in spite of the fact that the colonial people may be living under a feudal regime, because the victory of the colonial people is a defeat for imperialism and advances the interests of the international proletarian revolution which will destroy all forms of slavery in the backward countries. The right of self detremination of a colonial or semi-colonial people is not conditioned upon the form of government which that people may have.

Needless to say no revolutionary socialist would fail to explain that Haile Selassie rules the Ethiopian peasants and nomads with an iron hand for the benefit of the feudal nobility. Only the Stalinists are capable of making a hero out of Selassie. Probably from the habit of making a hero out of every miserable functionary. The fact remains that Italian imperialism under Mussolini is trying to subjugate Ethiopia under Selassie and not vice versa. The fact remains that a victory of Ethiopia under Selassie is a defeat of imperialism in general and of Italian imperialism in particular. And what must be emphasized over and over again, a defeat of Italian imperialism is a victory for the Italian working class and that kind of victory is a thousand times more important than a victory for the Ethiopians.

Against Supporting Neutrality Legislation

Once y[illegible] the position of defending the independence of a colonia[illegible]ia people against an attack of an im[illegible]
[illegible] follows that we cannot support any [illegible] the term 'neutrality' could be used [illegible] a revolutionary party, in the case [illegible]st powers, it is out of the question [illegible] working class. By supp[illegible]

[illegible] neutral it is impossible, laying aside all other considera[illegible] to support the idea of the NEC resolution that we compel [illegible] capitalist government to enact stricter neutrality legislation.

But if we do not support neutrality legislation are we not thereby, indirectly at least, encouraging the capitalist government to throw us into an imperialist war? Not at all! The working class does not want our capitalist government to involve us in any war; the Socialist party must struggle to prevent that government from declaring war. But the Socialist party must teach the working class and the people in general that no reliance whatever can be placed in the hypocritical declarations of a capitalist government in favor of peace. It must be repeated over and over again that only the workers, supported by other classes, through their own organized efforts, can prevent war, and that in the last analysis only a revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system can usher in permanent peace.

No capitalist government ever openly declared that it was in favor of war; peace is always what every capitalist government, including Hitler's, is striving for. Just as pacifists, in the capitalist government machine make it easier, when war is declared, to mobilize the masses behind the capitalist government, so any declaration of neutrality by a capitalist government will serve the same purpose. No worker should be misled into thinking that a capitalist government will be bound by neutrality legislation whenever it deems it necessary, in the interests of the capitalist class, to declare war.

Not that the Socialist party should carry on a campaign against neutrality but that it must carry on a campaign against the idea of trusting the peace declarations of a capitalist government. And should we have representatives in congress we must introduce amendments to the neutrality legislation which would show the insincerity of the capitalist advocates of neutrality.

Even admitting the questionable proposition that it is difficult to explain to the politically backward worker why we cannot support neutrality legislation introduced by a capitalist government, the difficulty of explaining why we supported neutrality legislation, in case a war is declared in spite of such legislation, will be a thousand times greater.

If we want to reason in a "logical" manner there is probably less chance of involving ourselves in a war through the independent activities of the working class than in urging governmental action even on behalf of neutrality. An embargo by government act is infinitely more provocative than a boycott by the workers themselves. And if we urge and support a governmental embargo, and if, because of that, we are involved in a war, how can we fail to support our government in such a war? All this abstractly "logical" reasoning, however, is irrelevant. The fundamental consideration is the necessity for the Socialist party to urge the workers to have no faith in a capitalist government's protestations for peace and to act independently of their capitalist government.

Against Sanctions by a Capitalist Government

If we are for the independence of Ethiopia why not be realistic and practical about the whole matter and ask that the powerful capitalist states apply sanctions against Mussolini and thus assure the independence of Ethiopia? So runs the argument of the reformist leaders of the Socialist and Communist parties. This kind of practicality is a negation of the class struggle and a betrayal of the proletariat. The NEC resolution and the YPSL proclamation are against sanctions and that is to their credit. The NEC resolution says nothing about the attitu[illegible] of the Labor party, of the Socialist and Communist Inter[illegible]; the YPSL proclamation mentions the positio[illegible] th[illegible] and Communist leaders but does not speci[illegible] position of revolutionary socialists [illegible] and we must not hesitate to mention

No imperialist government, least of [illegible]ted in the independence of Ethio[illegible] ment actually goes to war with I[illegible] will do so because its imperialis[illegible] such a war the socialists by ally[illegible] ists are actually fighting for [illegible] and not for the independence [illegible] working class. By supp[illegible]

national liberation ... Communist Parties will support war their own ruling class in defending the attacked na- ... We have Poland and Czechoslovakia in mind."

Further light is thrown on the subject by the Communist Party of Holland which has declared its readiness to fight in a war for the national independence of Holland.

Czechoslovakia, Poland and Holland are secondary imperialist powers. Holland has an enormous colonial empire. Czechoslovakia has a highly trustified industry which dominates the country; it has within its borders several million living as oppressed nationalities. Poland has a semi-fascist governmental system, is an inveterate enemy of the Soviet Union and ally of Nazi Germany, and is ruled by a clique dominated by large landowners and manufacturers. Poland is very similar to Austria in these respects. Would we support the ruling class of Austria in war for its national independence?

And of course, if the above countries are also to be defended, the smaller ones like monarchist Greece and Jugoslavia, imperialist Belgium, "neighborly" Rumania, Horthy Hungary follow as a matter of course, not to speak of the Scandinavian countries.

The policy is now complete. The last chapter has been written. The Comintern has not left a single loophole for refusing to fight in a capitalist war: If the Soviet Union is involved, we fight. If democratic countries fight fascist countries, we fight. If small imperialists are involved, we fight.

Only such far-fetched eventualities as a war between the United States and England alone, or between Germany and Italy alone are still open to us. Won't some good Browder-Pollitt-Stalin hurry and explain this neglect?

III

Perhaps the worst example of the degeneration of the Comintern attitude to war is to be seen in the manifesto of the Italian Communist Party on the Italo-Ethiopian situation. Of course the Italian Communists are unequivocally against Italy in this war, and that position is to be greeted. We must also take into account that the Italian Communists, like the Socialists, are working under the most difficult conditions, both in Italy and abroad. But we cannot overlook such gross opportunism as is found in the manifesto merely on this account. After all many have died for a false cause.

The manifesto is headed "For the Honor of Italy! Down with Mussolini and his Criminal Government!" Now this is a very peculiar reason to give for being opposed to the raid by Italy. "The honor of ... honor of Italy were as Mussolini insists, by the invasion of Ethiopia, would then be for it? Nor is this heading an accidental reference. dominates the entire manifesto and sets the tone. "The rul clique says.... that this war is demanded by our national hon This is false. Our honor is made slimy.... Down with the fasc aggressor that dishonors Italy."

In addition to the argument that the war is contrary to Italy' honor, here is the paragraph which summarized the reasons fo the Communists' opposition:

"This war is, from a military viewpoint, a tragic folly. will completely ruin the finances and economy of the country. focuses the indignation of the entire world against the brutality the cynicism and ill-will of fascist diplomacy, humiliating Italy in the eyes of all people."

Not one of these reasons is a class-conscious, proletarian reason. This type of opposition sounds like the opposition of rank-and-file fascists, not of revolutionary workers. At best, these arguments are the arguments of "rotten liberals." If the war were not a tragic folly, would we support it? If instead of ruining the economy and finances of the country, would we support it? And why should we regret the fact that it focuses the indignation of the entire world against fascism? Isn't it obvious that on the basis of such arguments no revolutionary struggle against fascism or against war can be conducted?

Here is another gem.

"The fascists say, the newspapers of the capitalist war profiteers say, that war will bring prosperity, riches, land, raw materials. This is false. It is a miserable lie."

Again we are compelled to ask: Suppose it were not a lie? Suppose Italy did gain all that is claimed? Would that be a reason for being any the less opposed to a war? As a matter of fact, how have all other imperialist powers established themselves in the world except thru war? As Socialists, we are not opposed to war by this or that country, merely because they do not achieve the specified objective. That is the point of view of the opposition groups of capitalists, but it cannot be the point of view of the working class.

If Italian fascism is weakened as a result of the war, if the finances and economy break down, if world opinion turns against Italy, then we have no reason to lament, for these conditions are the prerequisites for the success of the revolutionary struggle against fascism. This is revolutionary defeatism with which the manifesto of the Italian Communist Party has nothing in common.

TOWARD SOCIALIST CLARITY

ALBERT GOLDMAN

A Permanent Feature of the Appeal

COUNTLESS problems arise in the socialist movement. Theoretical and practical questions crowd in one upon another in different sections of the country. They cannot all be treated at length, especially in a magazine so small as the Appeal. But they should be mentioned and discussed. An attempt will be made to treat those questions which do not receive extended discussion either in the Appeal or elsewhere in our party press.

If comrades disagree they are at liberty to say so in letters, without mincing words. If not too long, the letters will be printed; if too long their gist will be given. There is nothing in the revolutionary movement so important from an educational standpoint as a serious discussion on questions of theory and practice. We can have all the lectures and classes in the world and our membership will know very little about the problems confronting our movement. One hot discussion involving an immediate problem or a theoretical question can educate our members more than a hundred lectures and classes. And what is more, party members, like other human beings, love a fight and will come to hear a discussion of opposing view points but will not come to a formal lecture or class. We hope that the readers of the Appeal will not hesitate to write and take issue with any new point presented in the pages of the Appeal and in this particular.

Socialist Election Victories

THE electoral victories achieved by the Socialist party in Reading and Bridgeport furnished occasion for the New Leader to go into raptures and to point out a moral which the right wing hopes the party members will take to heart. No one denies that the party organizations of Bridgeport and Reading are in the hands of the right wing. Consequently the fact that McLevy was elected mayor of Bridgeport and Stump mayor of Reading is to the right wing a justification for their kind of socialism.

"No pseudo-revolutionaries have shaped party policies, no scholastic speculations of what we will do during a period of chaos and confusion have disturbed the work of reaching the masses." So goes the editorial in the New Leader of Nov. 9th. It was said of the Bourbons of France that they learned nothing and forgot nothing. Of the right wing it can be said that they learn nothing and forget everything.

The socialists of Germany had tremendous electoral victories; the same is true of the communists of Germany. And what a pathetic role both parties played in the struggle against Hit... They also pointed to their gains during elections as ... tion that fascism could not gain power. The Austri... had a tremendous nu... ...es. But the leade... could only point ... little, weak fing... fascists. ... the Austrian

of the two cities. Tho... that the workers those cities have travelled away from the capitalist parties and expect something from the Socialist party. With McLevy and Lamp at the head of the Socialist parties in those cities the workers will surely be disappointed. Not the type of socialism represented by the good government socialists of Bridgeport, Reading and Milwaukee will solve the problems of the working class. Undoubtedly that type of socialism might receive more votes because McLevy and the rest of the reformists are ever ready to compromise in order to get votes and because it takes time for the workers to decide to take the path of struggle rather than of voting.

We are not at all opposed to socialist victories at the polls. We shall work for such victories at every opportunity. But revolutionary socialists never forget that such victories at best are only an indication as to the development of the masses. Such victories in themselves do not give power to the working class. The working class will gain power through organization and struggle and left wing socialists would much rather prefer a victory of the workers in a strike than in an election for an alderman. To utilize every election for the purpose of educating the masses in the principles of socialism and organizing them for the inevitable struggle is the task of revolutionary Marxists.

Let the right wing gloat at their "victory" and sneer at those who are interested in theoretical problems. Their road is that of the social democracy of Germany. The left wing, without minimizing the importance of the gains made, will realize that the struggle is far from being over with the election of a respectable socialist as a mayor of a city.

* * * *

Workers' Party Splits

LESS than a year old, the Workers' party has just experienced one of the inevitable "pains of growth." Some fifty to a hundred members of that party, led by Hugo Oehler, have been expelled from or left the party. They will probably form an addition to the numerous groups of revolutionary sectarians convinced that they are the only faithful disciples of Marx and Lenin.

At the very period when the Workers' party was being organized by the amalgamation of the Communist League of America (Trotskyites) and the American Workers' party (Musteites) Trotsky made a sharp tactical turn which history will undoubtedly record as one of the boldest and most brilliant maneuvers in revolutionary strategy. He advised the revolutionary internationalists of France to enter into the Socialist party. Later on he advised the same tactic for most of the other European countries. Naturally such a sharp turn caught many of his followers unaware and, accustomed to repeating formulas instead of analyzing every concrete situation, they accused Trotsky of "capitulating to the social-democracy."

In this country a bare handful of us also saw the necessity of bringing the isolation of the Trotskyists to an end by entering the Socialist party and participating in the general left wing movement of the party. The vast majority, however, determined to launch an independent party.

From the very beginning Oehler assumed a leftist position on the French turn and accused Cannon and Shachtman, the leaders of the W. P. of harboring designs of bringing the W. P. into the Socialist party. Although experiencing a considerable growth at the beginning, the new party did not continue to grow by leaps and bounds, as predicted by its organizers, and this fact aided in the formation of a factional grouping which in turn paralyzed the party completely. The question of the "French turn" was the center of the factional struggle. The more realistic Cannon saw the leftward movement in the Socialist party in this country and realized its importance; the doctrinaire Oehler swept that movement aside as of no consequence. A different approach to the leftward tendencies in the S. P. was advocated by the majority under Cannon advising a sympathetic approach to the Oehlerites. [illegible] the split has been consummated the W.P. is in a [illegible] to solve the problem [illegible]'s relationship to the [illegible]. It seems clear [illegible] as an independent W. P. has not [illegible] to except highly improbable. The [illegible]e revolutionary would be strengthened tremendously if the Trotskyites decide to enter the Socialist party. Composed of a group experienced revolutionists and probably the best trained theoretical group in the country, the Socialist party would have nothing to lose and everything to gain by admitting the Trotskyites into the party. The right wing, of course, will fight the admission of the Trotskyites tooth and nail but that should not for one moment make the left wing hesitate in advocating and fighting for their admission. Within the next six months we shall see whether the leadership of the W. P. and the leadership of the S. P. will futher the interests of the revolutionary movement—the former by applying for admission to the S. P. and the latter by accepting that application, with the understanding that they should be given all the rights and assume all the obligations of Socialist party members.

* * * *

Can the Stalinists Go Lower?

WE WERE handed a sample copy of the People's Press. It was a Stalinist sympathizer who presented us with it. A look of triumph on his face. "Take a look at that and see what we're doing to reach the masses." We glanced through and not until we saw the names of Frank L. Palmer, and Carl Haessler, two stalwart Stalinist stooges, were we convinced that the Stalinist sympathizer was really serious.

This messy paper will obviously be justified as part of the American Approach, an idea which recently catapulted Louis Budenz into the Communist party. If the Stalinists are taking over July 4th, Memorial Day and perhaps Armistice Day why not become real Americans and get a large circulation of the press by showing the dainty ankles (and parts above it) of Hollywood stars? Why not give the American people Stalinism through sexual suggestion? And so with the blessing of the Stalinists the sympathizers have launched an organ which is a prelude to the People's Front (and rear).

Let us for a moment glance through the philosophy of the paper. We say 'philosophy' because after all a former professor of philosophy is connected with it. The first page informs the readers that fascism is a result of Mussolini's fondness for loose women. Afflicted with syphillis his brains softened and the result was visions of grandeur. On that same first page we are also treated with a suggestion that Hearst is what he is because of his fondness for Marion Davies. Knowing what we do about the communists we hope, for their sake, that no investigation be made into the private lives of some of the leading communists. Two "snappy picture pages" will undoubtedly convince the innocents that socialism a la Stalin is really superior to capitalism.

Now if this were simply a venture to make some money for the promoters we would be tolerant and recognize the right of a human being living under the capitalist system to descend to the gutter in order to make an easy living although such people would surrender the right of being taken seriously in the labor movement. But we are certain that the People's Press was launched for the purpose of educating the American masses. In that case we are justified in asking: Must not the educators themselves be educated?

Several times before we were of the opinion that Stalinism had reached the lowest depths. With the venture of the People's Press we have become convinced that the pit is bottomless.

NOTE: Change in price and in subscription rates:

Single copies ..... 10 cents

Subscription:

6 issues ..... 50 cents
12 issues ..... one dollar

Chicago Editorial Committee

ERNEST ERBER ALBERT GOLDMAN

RUDOLPH C. OLSON

Business Mgr. Rudolph C. Olson